## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JULIE GOODWIN,

Plaintiff

v.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

16

17

21

MATTHEW JOHN, et al.,

**Defendants** 

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01642-APG-DJA

**Order Rejecting Proposed Joint Pretrial** Order

[ECF No. 61]

The parties' proposed Joint Pretrial Order does not satisfy Local Rule 16-3. The exhibit lists seem to include every document that has been produced in this case, numbered sequentially. See ECF No. 61 at 9-12. While the parties have stipulated to the admission of all of these exhibits (which will save time at trial) it is nearly impossible to actually show the jury even a fraction of those exhibits during a three-to-five-day trial. *Id.* at 14. Similarly, the plaintiff appears to have included in her witness list every person identified in discovery. ECF No. 61-1. 14 Nor is it permissible to include the catch-all of "[e]ach individual identified in Defendants' Rule 15||26(a)(1) initial disclosures." *Id.* at 9. Again, it is impossible to present 56 witnesses in a five-day trial.

Local Rule 16-3 is designed to streamline trial preparation and presentation, and to foster settlement. The parties cannot wait to make trial decisions until the eve of trial. Such tactics prevent full participation in settlement discussions and deprive the other side the ability to efficiently prepare for trial. While the parties are not required to list only those exhibits and witnesses they are sure to offer at trial, they cannot simply list every document and person 22 identified in discovery. More thought and effort is required. It is apparent from the proposed Joint Pretrial Order that the parties ignored these requirements of Local Rule 16-3.

I THEREFORE ORDER that the parties' proposed Joint Pretrial Order (ECF No. 61) is 2 rejected. The parties shall confer and submit a proper proposed Order by August 23, 2021. DATED this 28th day of July, 2021. ANDREW P. GORDON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE